

### **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated January 23, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the attached amendment and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented here are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has indicated that claims 4-8, 14-18 and 20 are allowable. Applicants cordially thank the Examiner for indication of the allowable subject matter. Claims 1, 6, 11, 16 and 22 have been amended. More specifically, claims 1, 11 and 22 have been amended to include the allowable subject matter indicated with respect to claims 6 and 16. No new matter has been added by the amendment. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-23 based on the amendment and the following remarks.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-3, 9-13 and 21-23 stand rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over Lin (U.S. Patent No. 6,259,615, hereinafter “Lin”) in view of Williams (U.S. Patent No. 6,127,785, hereinafter “Williams”). The Examiner states that Lin discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims except, *providing multiple lamps in parallel*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in FIG. 4B of Williams.

Independent claims 1, 11, and 22 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, wherein the feedback detection part includes an AND operation section that receives currents that flow in each of the lamps, so that the AND operation section provides the power supplying part with the feedback signal when at least one of the currents is out of a predetermined range, which the Examiner has indicated to define over the prior art of record as discussed on page 6 of the Detailed Action. In particular, the Examiner has indicated that the closest prior art fails to disclose “an AND operation section that receives currents that flow (in) each of the lamps, so that the AND operation section provides the power supplying part with the feedback signal when one of the currents is out of a predetermined range” as discussed on page 6 of the Detailed Action. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 11 and 22, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2-10, 12-21 and 23, define over Lin in view of Williams, either alone or in combination.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 1-3, 9-13 and 21-23 under § 103(a) be withdrawn and allow the same to issue.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks distinguishing the prior art of record, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' Attorneys at the below-listed telephone number regarding this Amendment or otherwise regarding the present application in order to address any questions or remaining issues concerning the same. If there are any charges due in connection with this response, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /James J. Merrick/

James J. Merrick  
Registration No. 43,801  
Confirmation No. 4082  
Cantor Colburn LLP  
20 Church Street 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Hartford, CT 06103  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Customer No. 23413

Date: April 22, 2008